

R E M A R K S

Applicants note with appreciation the interview courteously afforded the undersigned representative of the Applicants on June 4, 2008, wherein the following topics were discussed.

In the Office Action dated February 28, 2009, claims 1-10 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the Examiner stated that a parameter that defines the accessibility of packets is unlikely to be a parameter that specifies a slice thickness progression also. In fact, this is exactly the case in accordance with the present invention, which is why Applicants have previously argued that the invention is not obvious in view of the teachings of the references relied upon by the Examiner. Support for this feature is present in the disclosure as originally filed in the paragraph bridging pages 16 and 17, and is explained in detail in the example provided in the paragraph beginning at page 17, line 4.

This factor was explained in detail as well in the "Remarks" in Applicants' previous response, beginning with the fourth paragraph at page 7, through the fourth line from the bottom of page 8.

Claims 1-5, 10-11, 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gropper et al. in view of Slack, and further in view of Liu.

Applicants' previously-presented remarks concerning Gropper et al. and Slack are still considered by the Applicants as being relevant to the Examiner's continued reliance on the Gropper et al. and Slack references. In the latest Office Action, the Examiner has, for the first time, additionally relied on the Liu reference, as a basis for rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in combination with Gropper et al. and Slack.

As discussed in the telephone interview, Liu reference is but one of many hundreds, if not thousands, of references that describe the selection of slice thickness in the context of tomographic imaging. Simply having this general knowledge, however, does not provide any teachings or insights with regard to compression and decompression of data, and the subsequent display of the decompressed data, which is the subject matter of the claims of the present application. Therefore, in addition to Applicants' previous arguments concerning the Gropper et al. and Slack references, Applicants further submit that there is no basis in any of those references to modify anything disclosed in Gropper et al. and Slack in accordance with the teachings of Liu, other than to generate the original images with a selectable slice thickness, as is entirely conventional.

In the telephone interview, it was agreed that the rejection of claim 1 under §112, second paragraph would be withdrawn. In the latest Office Action, in view of that rejection, the Examiner stated that the language "defining permissible access to the respective packets" was not being considered in assessing the obviousness of claim 1 in view of Gropper et al., Slack and Liu. In view of the agreement to withdraw the rejection under §112. second paragraph, it was further agreed in the interview that, with this language "restored" to claim 1, the combination of references cited by the Examiner does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1, nor any of the claims depending therefrom.

The Examiner stated in the interview that, since this language is not present in claim 11, the rejection of claim 11 still would be justified. In order to advance prosecution, it was agreed at the interview that claim 11, and the claims depending therefrom would be cancelled and, if no more relevant prior art was located in an

updated search, the application would be allowed on the basis of claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom.

Although not discussed in the telephone interview, claim 6 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gropper et al., Slack and Liu, further in view of Sirohey et al., and claims 7-9, 12 and 14 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gropper et al., Slack and Liu, further in view of Onno et al. Applicants submit that the agreements reached in the interview concerning claim 1 are applicable to these rejections as well, to the extent that they apply to claims depending from claim 1.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants herewith request an extension of time of one month for responding to the Office Action dated February 26, 2009, so that the period for responding thereto is extended from May 26, 2009 to June 26, 2009. This response is accompanied by electronic payment in the amount of \$130.00 for the requisite extension fee.

The present Amendment does not raise not new issues requiring further searching or consideration, and is therefore properly enterable under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116. Early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Submitted by

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

**SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants

CH2\7357609.1